

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

GABRIEL PARKER (#M-00416),)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No: 13 C 5705
)	
v.)	
)	Judge Sharon Johnson Coleman
TOM DART, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [#3] is granted. The Court orders the trust fund officer at Plaintiff's current place of incarceration to deduct \$31.68 from Plaintiff's account for payment to the Clerk of Court as an initial partial filing fee. The Clerk shall send a copy of this order to the supervisor of the inmate trust account office at Danville Correctional Center. The Clerk shall issue summonses to Defendant Tom Dart, and the U.S. Marshal is directed to serve him. Defendant Dart remains as a Defendant solely for the purpose of identifying the Jane Doe medical Defendant. The Clerk is further directed to send Plaintiff a Magistrate Judge Consent Form, Instructions for Submitting Documents, and a copy of this order. Plaintiff's motion for attorney representation [#4] is denied.

STATEMENT

Plaintiff, an inmate in state custody at Danville Correctional Center, brings this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that he was subjected to deliberate indifference to a serious medical condition when he was incarcerated at the Cook County Jail. Plaintiff alleges that in February of 2102, he fell, injuring his right hand. He was taken to Cermak Health Services, where the x-ray technician told him that his hand was fine. However, when he arrived at Dixon Correctional Center a month later, the doctor there told him, based upon the x-ray in his file, that his hand had been broken. Plaintiff names as Defendants Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart and a Jane Doe x-ray technician.

Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1), Plaintiff is assessed an initial partial filing fee of \$31.68. The supervisor of inmate trust accounts at Danville Correctional Center is authorized and ordered to collect, when funds exist, the partial filing fee from Plaintiff's trust fund account and pay it directly to the Clerk of Court. After payment of the initial partial filing fee, the trust fund officer at Plaintiff's place of confinement is directed to collect monthly payments from Plaintiff's trust fund account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to the account. Monthly payments collected from Plaintiff's trust fund account shall be forwarded to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 until the full \$350 filing fee is paid. All payments shall be sent to the Clerk, United States District Court, 219 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Illinois 60604, attn: Cashier's Desk, 20th Floor, and shall clearly identify Plaintiff's name and the case number assigned to this action. The Danville inmate trust account office shall notify transferee authorities of any outstanding balance in the event Plaintiff is transferred from Danville to another correctional facility.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the Court is required to conduct a prompt threshold review of the complaint. Here, accepting Plaintiff's factual allegations as true, the Court finds that the complaint states a valid claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical condition. *Davis v. Carter*, 453 F.3d 686, 696 (7th Cir. 2006).

However, Plaintiff has failed to state a cause of action against any named Defendant. Plaintiff makes his claims against Defendant Dart in his supervisory capacity. Plaintiff has alleged no facts suggesting his direct, personal involvement, as required by *J.H. ex rel. Higgin v. Johnson*, 346 F.3d 788, 793 (7th Cir. 2003), *inter alia*. Nor has Plaintiff indicated that the alleged violation of his constitutional rights occurred at his direction or with his knowledge and consent. *Id.* Section 1983 creates a cause of action based on personal liability and predicated upon fault; thus, “to be liable under § 1983, an individual defendant must have caused or participated in a constitutional deprivation.” *Pepper v. Village of Oak Park*, 430 F.3d 809, 810 (7th Cir. 2005) (citations omitted).

The mere fact that Defendant Dart holds a supervisory position is insufficient to establish liability, as the doctrine of *respondeat superior* (blanket supervisory liability) does not apply to actions filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See *Sanville v. McCaughtry*, 266 F.3d 724, 740 (7th Cir. 2001). Section 1983 does not create collective or vicarious responsibility. *Id.* Supervisors cannot be held liable for the errors of their subordinates. *Birch v. Jones*, No. 02 C 2094, 2004 WL 2125416, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Sep. 22, 2004) (Manning, J.), citing *Pacelli v. DeVito*, 972 F.2d 871, 877 (7th Cir. 1992). “Supervisors who are merely negligent in failing to detect and prevent subordinates’ misconduct are not liable.” *Chavez v. Illinois State Police*, 251 F.3d 612, 651 (7th Cir. 2001) (citations omitted). To be held liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, supervisors “must know about the conduct and facilitate it, approve it, condone it, or turn a blind eye for fear of what they might see. They must in other words act either knowingly or with deliberate, reckless indifference.” *Id.* In short, some causal connection or affirmative link between the action complained about and the official sued is necessary for § 1983 recovery. *Hildebrandt v. Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources*, 347 F.3d 1014, 1039 (7th Cir. 2003). Because Plaintiff has failed to state any facts suggesting that Defendant Dart was personally involved in—or even aware of—the alleged circumstances giving rise to the complaint, he has failed to state a claim against him.

While Plaintiff has failed to state a claim against Defendant Dart, he is not dismissed as a Defendant. Plaintiff names a Jane Doe medical Defendant. (See Plaintiff's complaint). Plaintiff must name as a Defendant the individual medical personnel who was allegedly deliberately indifferent to his serious medical condition. If Plaintiff cannot name the individual medical personnel, he can name a supervisory official such as Tom Dart for the purpose of identifying unknown defendants. See *Donald v. Cook County Sheriff's Dept.*, 95 F.3d 548, 556 (7th Cir. 1996); *Billman v. Indiana Dept. of Corrections*, 56 F.3d 785, 789-90 (7th Cir. 1995). Thus, Dart remains as a Defendant only to the extent that he is necessary to assist Plaintiff in identifying the unnamed medical personnel.

Plaintiff is advised to conduct discovery as soon as possible to obtain the name of the medical personnel in question. The statute of limitations for Section 1983 actions filed in Illinois is two years. See 735 ILCS § 5/13-202; *Henderson v. Bolanda*, 253 F.3d 928, 931 (7th Cir. 2001), citing *Ashafa v. City of Chicago*, 146 F.3d 459, 462 (7th Cir. 1998). In this circuit, a Plaintiff cannot invoke the relation back principles of Rule 15(c) to replace the Jane Doe Defendant with a named Defendant after the statute of limitations has expired. See *Worthington v. Wilson*, 8 F.3d 1253, 1256-57 (7th Cir. 1993); see also *Wood v. Worachek*, 618 F.2d 1225, 1230 (7th Cir. 1980).

The Clerk shall issue summons for service of the complaint on Defendant Dart (hereinafter, "Defendant"). The Clerk shall also send Plaintiff a Magistrate Judge Consent Form and Instructions for Submitting Documents along with a copy of this order.

The United States Marshals Service is appointed to serve Defendant. Any service forms necessary for Plaintiff to complete will be sent by the Marshal as appropriate to serve Defendant with process. The U.S. Marshal is directed to make all reasonable efforts to serve Defendant. The Marshal is authorized to mail a request for waiver of service to Defendant in the manner prescribed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) before attempting personal service.

Plaintiff is instructed to file all future papers concerning this action with the Clerk of Court in care of the Prisoner Correspondent. Plaintiff must provide the Court with the original plus a complete judge's copy, including any exhibits, of every document filed. In addition, Plaintiff must send an exact copy of any Court filing to Defendant [or to defense counsel, once an attorney has entered an appearance on behalf of Defendant]. Every document filed with the Court must include a certificate of service stating to whom exact copies were mailed and the date of mailing. Any paper that is sent directly to the judge or that otherwise fails to comply with these instructions may be disregarded by the Court or returned to Plaintiff.

Finally, Plaintiff has submitted a motion for attorney representation. The motion is denied. There is no constitutional or statutory right to counsel in federal civil cases. *Romanelli v. Suliene*, 615 F.3d 847, 851 (7th Cir. 2010); *see also Johnson v. Doughty*, 433 F.3d 1001, 1006 (7th Cir. 2006). Nevertheless, the district court has discretion under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) to recruit counsel for an indigent litigant. *Ray v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc.*, 706 F.3d 864, 866-67 (7th Cir. 2013).

When a *pro se* litigant submits a request for assistance of counsel, the Court must first consider whether the indigent plaintiff has made reasonable attempts to secure counsel on his own. *Navejar v. Iyiola*, No. 12-1182, --- F.3d ---, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 10927 *7 (7th Cir. May 29, 2013) (citing *Pruitt v. Mote*, 503 F.3d 647, 654 (7th Cir. 2007) (en banc)). If so, the Court must examine "whether the difficulty of the case--factually and legally--exceeds the particular plaintiff's capacity as a layperson to coherently present it." *Navejar*, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 10927 at *7 (quoting *Pruitt*, 503 F.3d at 655). "The question ... is whether the plaintiff appears competent to litigate his own claims, given their degree of difficulty, and this includes the tasks that normally attend litigation: evidence gathering, preparing and responding to motions and other court filings, and trial." *Pruitt*, 503 F.3d at 655. The Court also considers such factors as the plaintiff's "literacy, communication skills, education level, and litigation experience." *Id.*

After considering the above factors, the Court concludes that the solicitation of counsel is not warranted in this case. While Plaintiff has submitted a motion for attorney representation that indicates that he has attempted to procure counsel on his own, the complaint sets forth cognizable claims and Plaintiff has alleged no physical or mental disability that might preclude him from adequately investigating the facts giving rise to his complaint. At this point, Plaintiff appears more than capable of litigating this matter. It should additionally be noted that the Court grants *pro se* litigants wide latitude in the handling of their lawsuits. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion for attorney representation is denied at this time. Should the case proceed to a point that assistance of counsel is appropriate, the Court may revisit this request.

Date: August 22, 2013

/s/ Sharon Johnson Coleman
United States District Court Judge